

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 20 and 32 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Claims 17, 21 and 36 have been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of August 4, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 8-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cymerman (Michael Cymerman, Automate your build process using Java and Ant) in view of Jerger *et al.* (US 6,321,334). Reversal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Cymerman and Jerger *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the claimed aspects.

The claimed subject matter provides a mechanism called “sandboxing” of a build platform that allows a developer to safely download, use, and augment their build processes. In one implementation, sandboxing allows the developer to mark different build entities with different levels of trust thereby mitigating the need of developers to fully trust all processes. Toward that end, claim 1 (and similarly claim 11) recites *a build process processor that processes one or more build entities; and a policy component that is processed by the build process processor to determine one or more levels of trust within which the build process operates; and wherein the one or more build entities are each associated with one or more levels of trust, such that at build time, a principal permission level under which the build process executes is determined by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities, and lowest level of trust of all involved build entities dictates the principal permission level for execution of the build process.* The cited art fails to teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

Cymerman teaches utilizing an ‘Ant’ tool to execute an automated build process. Ant facilitates constructing build scripts *via* a large number of built-in tasks without any customization. The ‘simple.xml’ is not a policy component that determines one or more levels

of trust for the build process. Rather the file ‘simple.xml’ is an xml file with a project entity comprising several target entities wherein the first line has information about an overall project to be built with target tasks and related attributes (*See e.g.* Cymerman page 3). Further, ‘if’ and ‘less’ commands can be used in the simple.xml to specify commands that are to be performed either *if* a certain property is set or *unless* that property is set. The *if* will execute when the property value is set, and the *unless* will execute if the value is not set (*See e.g.* Cymerman page 4). However, it fails to teach or suggest setting up a policy that sets a level of trust by which a conditional build process is executed as conceded on page 6 of the Nonfinal Office Action dated June 13, 2008.

A secondary document, Jerger *et al.*, is cited to overcome this deficiency. Jerger *et al.* relates to a security model for managing foreign content downloaded from a computer network. It teaches associating security zones with network locations and configurable protected operations corresponding to these zones that control the access to the host system by foreign content downloaded from the computer network (*See e.g.* Jerger *et al.* Abstract). The operations corresponding to these security zones are executed based on defined permissions. However, it fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency of Cymerman as it does not teach or suggest granting or denying permissions to specific build entities as recited in the subject claims. At the cited portion, Jerger *et al.* teaches editing of permission parameters within three permission sets associated with each security zone. Accordingly three permission sets are defined for signed and unsigned contents associated with different security zones and user interfaces are employed to allow a user to set permissions for different content from various security zones.

In view of the aforementioned, it is clear that the system of Jerger *et al.* requires voluntary input from the user in order to run a build process at a specific level of trust. In contrast, the claimed subject matter relates to a build process associated with different entities, each entity with a corresponding level of trust, which is executed at a permission level that is lowest of trust levels associated with the entities. By automatically selecting a lowest trust level from all the trust levels associated with the entities involved in the build process, the claimed subject matter mitigates a need for the user to specify trust levels for each entity as taught by Jerger *et al.* even while safely executing the build process.

Furthermore, independent claim 20 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method for managing a build process, the

method comprising *receiving a build process for building one or more build entities; associating the one or more build entities with a level of trust; **determining a principal permission level under which the build process executes by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities; and performing the build process at the lowest level of trust of all involved build entities.***

As stated *supra*, Cymerman teaches utilizing an ‘Ant’ tool to execute an automated build process. Ant facilitates constructing build scripts *via* a large number of built-in tasks without any customization. And, the ‘simple.xml’ is not a policy component that determines one or more levels of trust for the build process. Furthermore, Jerger *et al.* teaches editing of permission parameters within three permission sets associated with each security zone. Accordingly three permission sets are defined for signed and unsigned contents associated with different security zones and user interfaces are employed to allow a user to set permissions for different content from various security zones. Thus, the system of Jerger *et al.* requires voluntary input from the user in order to run a build process at a specific level of trust.

Further, independent claim 32 recites a system that facilitates control of a building process, comprising *means for providing an association between one or more build entities and a level of trust; means for determining a principal permission level under which the build process executes by analyzing the levels of trust associated with each of the build entities; and means for performing the build process at the lowest level of trust of all involved build entities used during the build process.*

As stated *supra*, Cymerman teaches utilizing an ‘Ant’ tool to execute an automated build process, wherein, the ‘simple.xml’ is not a policy component that determines one or more levels of trust for the build process. Furthermore, Jerger *et al.* teaches editing of permission parameters within three permission sets associated with each security zone. Thus, the system of Jerger *et al.* requires voluntary input from the user in order to run a build process at a specific level of trust. By automatically selecting a lowest trust level from all the trust levels associated with the entities involved in the build process, the claimed subject matter mitigates a need for the user to specify trust levels for each entity as taught by Jerger *et al.* even while safely executing the build process.

In view of at least the aforementioned deficiencies, it can be concluded that Cymerman in view of Jerger *et al.* fails to teach or suggest all aspects recited in independent claims 1, 11, 20

and 32. Therefore, reversal of the rejection of these independent claims and claims dependent there from is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP582US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Marisa J. Zink/

Marisa J. Zink

Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731